

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 19, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13 and 16-19 were pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 4-6, 13, and 16-19. Claim 30 is new. Reconsideration of the rejected claims and consideration of the newly presented claims is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objection

Claim 4 was objected to for depending upon canceled claim 3. Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the objection with respect to the claim be withdrawn.

II. Objections to the Specification

The specification as objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent bases for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the "time of display for the first HTML based request," as recited in claim 1, is not disclosed in the specification. Similar features are recited in claim 13. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to remove the reference to the "time of display for the first HTML based request." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the objection with respect to the claim be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 13 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to remove the reference to the "time of display for the first HTML based request." It is believed that the claims, as amended, are sufficiently disclosed and enabled. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 13 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because of their dependency on claim 1. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because of their dependency on claim 13.

Claim 1

The Examiner states that, as to the limitation in claim 1 "including the times of generation of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response" it is not ascertainable which server generates said "HTML based response" because the claim recites "forwarding the first HTML based request to one or more servers" and also recites "forwarding the HTML based response to one or more servers." (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 9).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" of claim 1 the first HTML based request arrives and which server made the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 9).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite " forwarding the first HTML based request to a first set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server " and "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the first HTML based request arrives at each server of the first set of servers, and the HTML based response is generated by a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" of claim 1 the first HTML based request departs and which server made the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 9).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite " forwarding the first HTML based request to a first set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server " and "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the first HTML based request departs from each server of the first set of servers, and the HTML based response is generated by a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 1 that "generating a second HTML based request...the time of display for the HTML based response," it is not ascertainable which server of "the one or more servers" responded. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 9). Applicants assume that the Examiner questions which server of the one or more servers generated the HTML based response.

Applicants assert that claim 1 recites "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 1 that "storing the times of generation...the HTML based response," it is not ascertainable in line 28-29 which server of "the one or more servers" responded. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 9-10). Applicants assume that the Examiner questions which server of the one or more servers generated the HTML based response.

Applicants assert that claim 1 recites "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 1 which recites "storing the...arrival times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response," it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" the first HTML based request arrived and it is not ascertainable which server made "the HTML based response." (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 10).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite " forwarding the first HTML based request to a first set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server " and "generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the first HTML based request arrives at each server of the first set of servers, and the HTML based response is generated by a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 1 which recites "storing the...departure times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response," it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" the first HTML based request departed from and it is not ascertainable which server made "the HTML based response." (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 10).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite " forwarding the first HTML based request to a first set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server " and "generating, by a

server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response." Accordingly, the first HTML based request departs from each server of the first set of servers, and the HTML based response is generated a server of the first set of servers. It is believed that claim 1 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 13

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "including the times of generation of the...HTML based response," it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" generates the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 11).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a second server of the plurality of servers for...generating an HTML based response " Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated a second server of the plurality of servers. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "at least one first server", "at least one second server," "at least one third server," it is not ascertainable at which server the first HTML based request arrives and which server made the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 11-12).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a second server of the plurality of servers for...generating an HTML based response," and "a first server of the plurality of servers for...depositing an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the first server." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a second server of the plurality of servers and the arrival time is the time that the first HTML based request arrives into the first server. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "the departure times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response", it is not ascertainable at which server the

first HTML based request departs from in line 23-24 of claim 13. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 11-12).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a first server of the plurality of servers for...depositing...a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the first server." Accordingly, the departure time is the time that the first HTML based request departs from the first server. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "generation of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response," it is not ascertainable at which server of the "one or more servers" generates the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 12).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a second server of the plurality of servers for...generating an HTML based response " Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a second server of the plurality of servers. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "at least one first server", "at least one second server," "at least one third server," it is not ascertainable in line 33-34 at which server the first HTML based request arrives and which server made the HTML based response. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 12-13).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a second server of the plurality of servers for...generating an HTML based response," and "a first server of the plurality of servers for...depositing an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the first server." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a second server of the plurality of servers and the arrival time is the time that the first HTML based request arrives into the first server. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that in claim 13 which recites "the departure times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response", it is not ascertainable in lines 34-35 at which server the first HTML based request departs from in line 23-24 of claim 13. (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 11-12).

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite "a second server of the plurality of servers for...generating an HTML based response," and "a first server of the plurality of servers for...depositing...a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the first server." Accordingly, the HTML based response is generated by a second server of the plurality of servers and the departure time is the time that the first HTML based request departs from the first server. It is believed that claim 13 is sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-6 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-19 depend from claim 13, and as such, are also sufficiently definite. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection for these claims be withdrawn.

V. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen and in further view of Dutta

Claims 1, 5, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick Jr. et al. (US Patent 6,625,647) (hereinafter "Barrick") in view of Chen et al. (US Patent 5,793,976) (hereinafter "Chen") and in further view of Dutta et al. (US Publication 2002/0161794) (hereinafter "Dutta"). Claim 1 is allowable as Barrick, Chen, and Dutta either alone or in any combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

For example, claim 1 recites in part:

depositing a time of generation of the first HTML based request in one or more hidden data fields associated with the first HTML based request;
forwarding the first HTML based request to a first set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the first set of servers deposits in the one or more hidden data fields associated with the first HTML based request an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server;
generating, by a server of the first set of servers, an HTML based response in response to receiving the first HTML based request;

depositing a time of generation of the HTML based response in one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response;
transferring the arrival times, the time of generation of the HTML based request, and the departure times to the one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response;
forwarding the HTML based response to a second set of servers of the plurality of servers, wherein each server of the second set of servers deposits in the one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response an arrival time of the HTML based response arriving into the server and a departure time of the HTML based response departing from the server;
receiving the HTML based response to a browser for displaying the HTML based response, the browser operable to store a time of arrival and a time of display for the HTML based response;
generating a second HTML based request, the second HTML based request including the times of generation of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response, the arrival times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response, the departure times of the first HTML based request and the HTML based response, and the time of display for the HTML based response in one or more hidden data fields associated with the second HTML based request, (emphasis added).

As recited above, claim 1 specifically recites "transferring the arrival times, the time of generation of the HTML based request, and the departure times to the one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response." Applicants submit that at least these features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta either alone or in any combination.

The Examiner recognizes that Barrick does not teach this feature. (Office Action dated 03/19/2008, p. 20). Chen is relied upon for such teaching. The Examiner asserts that arrival/departure times are recorded into multiple time stamp fields at each node along the virtual connection, thus transferring/storing the times (Office Action dated 11/27/2006, p. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chen describes

The information field of the management cell will also optionally contain a 4-byte Timestamp field 9, a Delay-stamp field 10, and a Cell Loss Count field 12, as well as other function-specific fields 14 that are used for additional delay-stamps, cell loss counts. (Chen, col. 7, lines 58-63). For accumulated delay, at each node the cell is stamped in the Timestamp field 9 with the time of entry into the node. This time is then compared to the time of exit from that node and the calculated delay is recorded into the cell in one of a multiple of unused Delay-stamp fields 22. (Chen, col. 8, lines 62-66). For node-by-node delays, additional timestamp fields can be used for each node, allowing the switch to merely record in one timestamp field the time that the packet arrives, and then record the time the packet leaves into another timestamp field. (Chen, col. 9, lines 4-8).

Chen does not teach or suggest transferring data from an HTML request to an HTML response. Claim 1 recites that the arrival times, the time of generation of the HTML

based request, and the departure times (which were deposited in the HTML based request) are transferred to the HTML based response. Chen merely states that timing data is recorded in the same management packet as it is moved along the virtual connection. (Chen, Figs. 3-5, col. 8, lines 62-66, col. 9, lines 4-8). Each node in the packet records delay information or other timing information. Chen describes that the management packet includes a payload with the delay and/or timing information, instead of carrying user data. (Chen, Abstract). It is well known by those of skill in the art that a packet is not a request and/or response. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a valid prior art reference to show such equivalence. At most, the combination teaches sending an HTML request and receiving an HTML response (Barrick), and that along a path from the source and destination of the HTML request or along the path from the source and destination of the HTML response, a switch or router transfers node delay data in a packet. Thus, the HTML response would not include data transferred from the HTML request.

Applicants assert that Dutta does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to claim 1. Dutta describes rendering of multimedia objects in a browser. (Dutta, Abstract). There is no mention or suggestion in Dutta of transferring data from an HTML request to an HTML response. Thus, Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "transferring the arrival times, the time of generation of the HTML based request, and the departure times to the one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response," as recited in claim 1.

As recited above, claim 1 specifically recites that "depositing a time of generation of the first HTML based request in one or more hidden data fields associated with the first HTML based request," and "depositing a time of generation of the HTML based response in one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response." Applicants submit that at least these features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta either alone or in any combination.

Barrick describes a method for gathering download time intervals, encoding it in a HTTP GET request header, and measuring the download time of a web page experienced by a

user accessing the web page. (Barrick, col. 2, lines 10-15). The Examiner recognizes that Barrick does not teach "depositing a time of generation of the first HTML based request." stating that Barrick is cited for teaching "depositing time-related data in the delta field" of an HTTP GET request header. (Office Action dated 3/09/2007, p. 16). Chen is cited for teaching these features. The Examiner asserts that Chen teaches "the times of generation of the request." (Office Action dated 3/09/2007, p. 17). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that "at the beginning of this chain, time of generation is recorded...After that, time of arrival and departure are recorded all the way along the chain." (Office Action dated 11/27/2006, p. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chen teaches monitoring the performance of a packet-switched data network. A new class of packet, i.e., management packet, has a payload that is modifiable by nodes (i.e., switches or routers) along a virtual connection. (Chen, col. 4, lines 41-45, Abstract). Chen also describes

The information field of the management cell will also optionally contain a 4-byte Timestamp field 9, a Delay-stamp field 10, and a Cell Loss Count field 12, as well as other function-specific fields 14 that are used for additional delay-stamps, cell loss counts. (Chen, col. 7, lines 58-63). For accumulated delay, at each node the cell is stamped in the Timestamp field 9 with the time of entry into the node. This time is then compared to the time of exit from that node and the calculated delay is recorded into the cell in one of a multiple of unused Delay-stamp fields 22. (Chen, col. 8, lines 62-66). For node-by-node delays, additional timestamp fields can be used for each node, allowing the switch to merely record in one timestamp field the time that the packet arrives, and then record the time the packet leaves into another timestamp field. (Chen, col. 9, lines 4-8).

Chen only describes that the time the management packet arrives in the switch is recorded in the timestamp field of the payload of the management packet. Likewise, the time that the management packet leaves the switch can also be recorded in another time stamp field of the management packet. Cumulative delay can be recorded in a delay stamp field of the management packet. Neither the delay stamp field nor the time stamp fields record a time of generation of an HTML request, as is recited in claim 1. The time that the management packet arrives in the switch in no way is the same measurement of as the time of generation of an HTML request. The time that the management packet leaves the switch in no way is the same measurement of as the time of generation of an HTML request. The calculated delay from a

management packet entering a switch and leaving the switch in no way is the same measurement of as the time of generation of an HTML request. Chen makes no mention or suggestion of measuring a time of generation of a request, as was suggested by the Examiner. Arrival, departure, and delay times are not the same as a time of generation. Chen is measuring times associated with management packets. This is very different from the features recited in claim 1, which measures the time of generation of an HTML request. Even if, for purposes of argument, Chen describes a generation time for a management packet, the generation time for a management packet is not the same as the generation time for an HTML request. Stated another way, management packets are not the same as HTML requests, and the times associated with the earlier do not equate with the times associated with the latter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a valid prior art reference for showing of such equivalence. As such, Chen does not measure the time of generation of an HTML request.

Applicants assert that Dutta does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to claim 1. Dutta describes rendering of multimedia objects in a browser. (Dutta, Abstract). There is no mention or suggestion in Dutta of measuring a time of generation of an HTML request, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "depositing a time of generation of the first HTML based request in one or more hidden data fields associated with the first HTML based request." Under similar rationale, Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "depositing a time of generation of the HTML based response in one or more hidden data fields associated with the HTML based response," as recited in claim 1, or other features of the claim which include times of generation of the HTML based request/response.

As recited above, claim 1 specifically recites that "forwarding the first HTML based request...each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server," and "forwarding the HTML based response...each server of the second set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the HTML based response arriving into the

server and a departure time of the HTML based response departing from the server." Applicants submit that at least these features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta either alone or in any combination.

The Examiner recognizes that Barrick does not teach "an arrival time and a departure time for the first HTML based request/response." (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 20). Chen is cited for teaching these features. The Examiner asserts that Chen teaches "arrival times and departure times" (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 21). The Examiner recognizes that Barrick fails to disclose "servers that each deposit an arrival time and a departure time for the first HTML based request." (Office Action dated 3/19/2008, p. 20). Chen is relied upon for such teaching. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Chen also describes

For node-by-node delays, additional timestamp fields can be used for each node, allowing the switch to merely record in one timestamp field the time that the packet arrives, and then record the time the packet leaves into another timestamp field. (Chen, col. 9, lines 4-8).

Applicants submit that Chen fails to describe arrival and departure times for HTML requests. Instead, Chen describes that the time the management packet arrives in the switch is recorded in the timestamp field of the payload of the management packet. Likewise, the time that the management packet leaves the switch can also be recorded in another time stamp field of the management packet. Chen is measuring times associated with management packets. This is very different from the features recited in claim 1, which measures the arrival and departure times of an HTML request. The arrival and departure times for a management packet is not the same as arrival and departure times for an HTML request. Stated another way, management packets are not the same as HTML requests, and the times associated with the earlier do not equate with the times associated with the latter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a valid prior art reference for showing of such equivalence. As such, Chen does not measure the arrival time and the departure time of an HTML request.

Furthermore, Chen does not disclose servers that each deposit an arrival time and a departure time for the first HTML based request, as recited in claim 1. In particular, Chen merely describes that nodes (i.e., switches or routers) record timing data. (Chen, Abstract, col. 9,

lines 4-8). Switches or routers are not the same as servers. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a valid prior art reference for showing of such equivalence. At most, Barrick describes servers and Chen describes switches or routers which record timing data. The combination of Barrick and Chen, teaches sending the HTML GET request to a web server or a relay server and a switch or router along the route may insert timing data of a packet. It should also be noted that a packet is not the same as an HTML request. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a valid prior art reference for showing of such equivalence. As such, Chen does not teach or suggest servers that each deposit an arrival time and a departure time for the first HTML based request.

Applicants assert that Dutta does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to claim 1. Dutta describes rendering of multimedia objects in a browser. (Dutta, Abstract). There is no mention or suggestion in Dutta of measuring arrival and departure times of an HTML request nor of servers which deposit such information in the HTML request, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "forwarding the first HTML based **request**...each server of the first set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the first HTML based request arriving into the server and a departure time of the first HTML based request departing from the server." Under a similar rationale, Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "forwarding the HTML based **response**...each server of the second set of servers deposits...an arrival time of the HTML based response arriving into the server and a departure time of the HTML based response departing from the server," or other features of claim 1 which include arrival time and departure time for the first HTML based request/response.

As recited above, claim 1 specifically recites that "receiving the HTML based response to a browser for displaying the HTML based response, the browser operable to store a time of arrival and a time of display for the HTML based response." Applicants submit that at least these features recited in claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta either alone or in any combination.

Applicants point out that the Examiner failed to respond to Applicants' arguments based on this feature as described in the Response dated 07/18/2007. As such, the arguments are repeated herein. The Examiner states that Barrick in view of Chen does not disclose "a time of display for the HTML based response." (Office Action dated 03/19/2008, p. 24).

Moreover, Dutta does not make up for these deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to claim 1. The office action cites to Dutta, which states that "the browser maintains a list of all of the screen images that have been captured within a configurable duration of time, and the time that the screen image was captured," (Dutta, [0047]) for teaching "a time of display for the HTML based response, as recited in claim 1. (Office Action, p. 9). Dutta further describes that "the succession of captured screen images are stored in a list 351 in memory preferably at the client. (Dutta, [0045]). It should be noted that a time of capture of a screen shot is not the same as a time of display for the HTML based response. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide a valid prior art reference for showing of such equivalence. There is no indication that the time of screen shot capture occurs instantaneously with the time of display. Moreover, even assuming that Dutta teaches what is stated and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to these claims.

Independent claim 13 also recites limitations that are not taught or suggested by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta for reasons including those discussed above, such that claims 1 and 13 and dependent claims 2, 4-6 and 16-19 cannot be rendered obvious by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta, either alone or in any combination.

VI. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen in view of Dutta and further in view of Fish

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick in view of Chen et al. in view of Dutta and further in view of Fish et al. (US Publication

2004/0111394) (hereinafter "Fish"). Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, which is not rendered obvious by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta as discussed above.

Fish does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. Fish teaches the use of hidden fields in an HTML document for storing debug information (Fish, [0009 - 0010]), and is cited as teaching the displaying of these hidden data fields to a user (Office Action 11/27/2006, p. 11). Even assuming that Fish teaches what is cited and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. As such, Fish cannot render obvious Applicants' claims 1 or 2, either alone, or in any combination with Barrick, Chen, and Dutta.

VII. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen in view of Dutta and further in view of Packman

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick in view of Chen in view of Dutta and further in view of Packman et al. (US Publication 2003/0225877) (hereinafter "Packman"). Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1, which is not rendered obvious by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta as discussed above.

Packman does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. Packman is cited as teaching the one or more servers including at least one application server and a database server. (Office Action 11/27/2006, p. 12). Even assuming that Packman teaches what is cited and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. As such, Packman cannot render obvious Applicants' claims 1 or 4, either alone or in any combination with Barrick, Chen, and Dutta.

VIII. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen and in further view of Engel

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick in view of Chen and in further view of Engel (US Publication 2004/0246996) (hereinafter "Engel").

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1, which is not rendered obvious by Barrick and Chen as discussed above.

Engel does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to these claims. Engel is cited as teaching the synchronizing of servers. (Office Action 11/27/2006, p. 13). Even assuming that Engel teaches what is cited and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to these claims. As such, Engel cannot render obvious Applicants' claims 1 or 6, either alone, or in any combination with Barrick and Chen.

IX. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen in view of Dutta and further in view of Struble

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick in view of Chen in view of Dutta and further in view of Struble (US Publication 2003/0004796) (hereinafter "Struble"). Claims 16 and 17 depend from independent claim 13, which is not rendered obvious by Barrick, Chen, and Dutta as discussed above.

Struble does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. Struble is cited as teaching an internal clock to keep local time. (Office Action 11/27/2006, p. 13). Even assuming that Struble teaches what is cited and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick, Chen, and Dutta with respect to these claims. As such, Struble cannot render obvious Applicants' claims 13, 16 or 17, either alone, or in any combination with Barrick, Chen, and Dutta.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections with respect to pending claims 1-6, 13-14, and 16-19 be withdrawn.

X. Rejection under 35 USC § 103, Barrick in view of Chen and in further view of Blythe

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrick in view of Chen and in further view of Blythe et al. (US Publication 2004/0139433) (hereinafter

"Blythe"). Claim 19 depends from independent claim 13, which is not rendered obvious by Barrick and Chen as discussed above.

Blythe does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to these claims. Blythe is cited as teaching the use of application servers in a distributed environment. (Office Action 11/27/2006, p. 14). Even assuming that Blythe teaches what is cited and that there is a motivation to combine, this teaching does not make up for the deficiencies in Barrick and Chen with respect to these claims. As such, Blythe cannot render obvious Applicants' claims 13 or 19, either alone, or in any combination with Barrick and Chen.

XI. Newly Presented Claim30

Claim30 has been added to cover different aspects of the present invention. This claim is supported by the specification and do not add new matter. The elements recited in claim 30 are believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least a similar rationale as discussed with respect to claim 1, and others. Applicants therefore respectfully request consideration and allowance of newly presented claim 30.

X. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Naya M. Chatterjee-Marathe/

Naya M. Chatterjee-Marathe
Reg. No. 54,680

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
NMC:pas
61348682 v1